

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 remain in the application. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended with particular attention to the points raised in the Office Action. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present amendment.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the drawings as allegedly needing translation.

It is respectfully submitted that an object of the present invention is to allow changing of a layout of objects of a vertically-arrayed text to a horizontal orientation, and vice versa (see specification of the present application, p. 2, lns. 15-20). Examples of vertically-arrayed texts include Japanese and Chinese language texts (see id., lns. 1-2).

That is, an embodiment of the present invention is directed to the processing of vertically-arrayed (e.g., Japanese, Chinese, etc.) texts. Therefore, the drawings contain illustrations of vertically-arrayed texts.

It is submitted that the non-English language items depicted in Figs. 2A-8C, 10-11, and 14 are illustrative of the vertical and horizontal layout of the texts to which the present invention is directed, and not descriptive of the elements of the figures.

Withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the objection to the specification as allegedly containing informalities.

The instances noted in the Office Action have been

corrected by the amendments made to the abstract and to the specification hereby.

Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 12, 15, 18-20, 29, 37, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly lacking patentable utility.

The claims have been amended in light of the comments of the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention possesses patentable utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that when evaluating claim language during examination of an application, the terminology of a claim is required to be given its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification, and that claim language cannot be read in a vacuum, but instead must be read in light of the specification as it would have been interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. See In re Sneed, 710 F.2d 1544, 218 USPQ 385 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 44 USPQ2d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 12, 15, 18-20, 29, 37, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,813,018 (Kaji et al.).

Applicants have carefully considered the comments of the Office Action and the cited reference, and respectfully submit

that claims 1-52 are patentably distinct over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates to an information processing method and apparatus. Drawing information including at least one object that can be displayed, information pertinent to the size in the line direction and in the line feed direction of the object, and layout-related information are analyzed. Coordinate information pertinent to a display start position of the object in a drawing area is acquired based on a result of the analysis, the coordinate information pertinent to the display start position is converted based on the layout-related information acquired by the results of analysis, and the converted coordinate information pertinent to the display start position is converted into real drawing coordinate information on the drawing area.

Kaji et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a document processing method and system for automating pre-processing for figure translation including extraction of source language sentences from figures, and postprocessing in figure translation including embedding of translated sentences in drawings. The pre-processing consists of recognizing regions included in a source figure, extracting a sentence from each region, and extracting the topological characteristics of the figure. The post-processing consists of enlarging or shrinking each sentence display region according to the change of the sentence length by translation, and generating a figure that preserves the extracted topological characteristics and includes the enlarged/shrunken sentence display regions.

The Office Action cites col. 3, lns. 56-66 of Kaji et al. as disclosing an information processing method including, inter alia, a step of analyzing drawing information including layout designating information for specifying a relative position direction with respect to a direction of arranging an object, and generating real display position corresponding to the layout designating information obtained by the analysis of the drawing information (see Office Action, p. 4, lns. 1-10). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As understood by Applicants, the section of Kaji et al. cited by the Office Action relates to an embodiment wherein handwritten figures are read as binary image data of a drawing (see Kaji et al., col. 3, lns. 56-66). The binary image data are then analyzed, characters are recognized, and sentences are extracted (see id.). Shape information is extracted from the data, and the size of the drawing area and placement of sentences in the drawing are is determined (see id.).

The above steps allow for automatic scaling (enlargement/reduction) functions that are necessary for embedding text and modifying drawings (see id., col. 4, lns. 20-27). The modified drawing takes over the topology, shape, and visual characteristics of the source drawing (see id., lns. 15-17).

That is, as understood by Applicants, the system of Kaji et al. provides for automatic enlargement and reduction of text and figures during composition of documents.

In contrast, the present invention discloses a method, apparatus, and medium allowing a command text to be used for

both vertically-arrayed and horizontally-arrayed text, and allowing for the convenient conversion of vertically-arrayed text to horizontally-arrayed text and vice versa (see specification of the present application, p. 2, lns. 15-20).

In the present invention the drawing information is analyzed to specify a relative position direction with respect to an arranging direction, a relative placing position is determined, and real display position information is generated based upon the relative placing position and the arranging direction.

It is respectfully submitted that Kaji et al. does not disclose or suggest "an information processing method comprising the steps of analyzing drawing information including information of at least one object that can be displayed and layout designating information for specifying a relative position direction with respect to a direction of arranging the object, determining a relative placing position of the object in a desired drawing area based on layout definition information corresponding to the layout designating information obtained by the analysis of the drawing information, and generating real display position information corresponding to the relative placing position of the object responsive to the arranging direction, as described above and as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited reference. Amended independent claims 6, 12, 15, 18-20, 29,

37, and 45, and the claims depending therefrom, are believed to be patentable over the cited reference for at least similar reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.


The references cited as of interest have been reviewed, but are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Should the Examiner disagree, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specify where in the cited document there is a basis for such disagreement.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/AVF